

1 GREGORY P. STONE (State Bar No. 78329)
2 gregory.stone@mto.com
3 BRADLEY S. PHILLIPS (State Bar No. 85263)
4 brad.phillips@mto.com
5 STEVEN M. PERRY (State Bar No. 106154)
6 steven.perry@mto.com
7 BETHANY W. KRISTOVICH (State Bar No. 241891)
8 bethany.kristovich@mto.com
9 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
10 355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor
11 Los Angeles, California 90071-1560
12 Telephone: (213) 683-9100
13 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

14 Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17 SAN JOSE

18 IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE
19 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

20 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

21 ALL ACTIONS

22 Case No. 5:11-cv-2509-LHK

23 **DEFENDANTS' JOINT
24 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO FILE
25 UNDER SEAL**

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11 and 79-5, Defendants Adobe Systems, Inc., Apple Inc., Google Inc., Intel Corporation, Intuit Inc., Lucasfilm Ltd., and Pixar (collectively, “Defendants”) hereby jointly move to seal redacted portions of the following:

(i) Exhibit A attached to the Omnibus Declaration of Christina J. Brown in Support of Defendants’ Replies in Support of Joint Motion to Exclude Testimony of Edward E. Leamer, Ph.D. and Joint Motion to Strike Improper Rebuttal Testimony in Dr. Leamer’s Reply Expert Report (“Omnibus Brown Declaration”); and

(ii) Exhibit 1 attached to the Declaration of Eric Evans filed in support of Google’s Reply in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment.

The redacted information has been designated Confidential or Attorneys’ Eyes Only under the Stipulated Protective Order (Modified by the Court) (Dkt. No. 107). Defendants are concurrently filing declarations in support of the respective sealing requests and are concurrently filing a proposed order listing each document sought to be redacted and the specific support for each request.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides broad discretion for a trial court to permit sealing of documents for, inter alia, the protection of “a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)(G).

Where the documents are submitted in connection with a dispositive motion, the Ninth Circuit has ruled that documents should be sealed when “compelling reasons” exist for protecting information from public disclosure. *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178-79 (9th Cir. 2006). Courts have found that “[o]ne factor that weighs in favor of sealing documents [under the compelling reasons standard] is when the release of the document will cause competitive harm to a business.” *Apple v. Samsung*, 727 F.3d 1214, 1221-22 (Fed. Cir. 2013); *Apple Inc. v. PsystarCorp.*, 658 F.3d 1150, 1162 (9th Cir. 2011) (“The publication of materials that could result in infringement upon trade secrets has long been considered a factor that would overcome this strong presumption.”); *see also Nixon v. Warner Commc’n, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978) (“common-law right of inspection has bowed before the power of a court to

1 insure that its records” are not used as “sources of business information that might harm a
 2 litigant’s competitive standing”). Moreover, the release of trade secrets constitutes “compelling
 3 reasons” sufficient to outweigh the public’s interest in disclosure. *Samsung*, 727 F.3d at 1221-22.

4 **II. COMPELLING REASONS EXIST TO SEAL CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION
 5 SUBMITTED IN CONNECTION WITH PLAINTIFFS’ OPPOSITION PAPERS.**

6 The redacted portions of Exhibit A to the Omnibus Brown Declaration and Exhibit 1 to
 7 the Evans Declaration filed in support of Google’s Reply in support of its Motion for Summary
 8 Judgment contain highly confidential and commercially sensitive information about employee
 9 compensation, as well as confidential hiring data, which reveal confidential recruiting and hiring
 10 strategies, practices, and policies. Defendants also seek to keep under seal the personal
 11 identifying or private information of employees and third parties. Defendants designated the
 12 foregoing information “Confidential” or “Attorneys Eyes Only” under the Protective Order.

13 As the concurrently filed declarations demonstrate, Defendants keep the sealed
 14 information confidential and the public disclosure of this information would cause each
 15 Defendant harm by giving third-parties (including individuals responsible for competitive
 16 decision-making) insights into confidential and sensitive aspects of each of the Defendants’
 17 strategies, competitive positions, and business operations, allowing these third-parties to
 18 potentially gain an unfair advantage in dealings with and against each of the Defendants.

19 This type of information is regularly sealed because disclosure could cause competitive
 20 harm. *See, e.g., Rich v. Shrader*, No. 09CV652, WL 6028305, at *3-4 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2013)
 21 (granting motion to seal deposition testimony attached to summary judgment motion that contains
 22 “information on Booz Allen compensation policies” and “internal policies and controls with
 23 regards to employee performance and review”); *Krieger v. Atheros Commc’ns, Inc.*, No. 11-CV-
 24 00640, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 68033 at *3-4 (N.D. Cal. June 25, 2011) (sealing “sensitive and
 25 confidential information, including long-term financial projections, discussions of business
 26 strategy, and competitive analyses” under the compelling reasons standard); *EEOC v. Kokh, LLC*,
 27 No. CIV-07-1043, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 82526, at n.1, 2010 BL 187807 (W.D. Okla. Aug. 09,
 28 2012) (sealing summary judgment materials that discuss “confidential salary information”);
Network Appliance, Inc. v. Sun Microsystems Inc., No. C-07-06053, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS

1 21721, at *9 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2010) (sealing “internal information regarding [defendant’s]
2 business strategies and opportunities that were not widely distributed”); *see also TriQuint
3 Semiconductor, Inc. v. Avago Techns. Ltd.*, No. CV 09-531, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 143942, at *9
4 (D. Ariz. Dec. 13, 2011) (granting motion to seal “market analysis information,” under
5 compelling reasons standard, including business strategy documents, such as information relating
6 to “product competitiveness, and market and technological opportunities and risks”).

7 Moreover, the redacted information constitutes trade secrets, defined as “any formula,
8 pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives
9 him an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it.”
10 *Samsung*, 727 F.3d at 1221-22. As evidenced by the concurrently filed declarations, the
11 information Defendants seek to seal relate to Defendants’ internal business practices and
12 strategies used in compensating, recruiting, and hiring employees. This falls plainly within the
13 trade secrets definition. *Id.*; *see also In re Electronic Arts, Inc.*, 298 F. App’x. 568, 569-70 (9th
14 Cir. 2008).

15 **III. CONCLUSION**

16 For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that this Court order the above-
17 referenced materials be placed under seal.

18
19
20 Dated: February 27, 2014

MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON LLP

21
22
23 By: /s/ John Mittelbach
John Mittelbach

24 355 South Grand Avenue, 35th Floor
25 Los Angles, CA 90071-1560
Telephone: (213) 683-9100
26 Facsimile: (213) 687-3702

27 *Attorneys for Defendant INTEL CORPORATION*

1
2 Dated: February 27, 2014

KEKER & VAN NEST LLP

3
4 By: /s/ Robert A. Van Nest
Robert A. Van Nest

5
6 Daniel Purcell
7 Eugene M. Paige
Justina Sessions
633 Battery Street
8 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 391-5400
Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

9
10 Dated: February 27, 2014

MAYER BROWN LLP

11
12 By: /s/ Lee H. Rubin
Lee H. Rubin

13
14 Edward D. Johnson
Donald M. Falk
15 Two Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real, Suite 300
16 Palo Alto, CA 94306-2112
Telephone: (650) 331-2057
Facsimile: (650) 331-4557

17
18 Attorneys for Defendant GOOGLE INC.

19
20 Dated: February 27, 2014

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

21
22 By: /s/ Michael F. Tubach

1 Michael F. Tubach

2 George Riley
3 Christina J. Brown
4 Two Embarcadero Center, 28th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94111
6 Telephone: (415) 984-8700
7 Facsimile: (415) 984-8701

8
9
10 *Attorneys For Defendant APPLE INC.*

11 Dated: February 27, 2014

12 JONES DAY

13 By: /s/ David C. Kiernan
14 David C. Kiernan

15 Robert A. Mittelstaedt
16 Lin W. Kahn
17 555 California Street, 26th Floor
18 San Francisco, CA 94104
19 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
20 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

21 *Attorneys for Defendant ADOBE SYSTEMS, INC.*

22 Dated: February 27, 2014

23 JONES DAY

24 By: /s/ Robert A. Mittelstaedt
25 Robert A. Mittelstaedt

26 Robert A. Mittelstaedt
27 Craig E. Stewart
28 555 California Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 626-3939
Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

29 Catherine T. Zeng
30 JONES DAY
31 1755 Embarcadero Road
32 Palo Alto, CA 94303
33 Telephone: (650) 739-3939
34 Facsimile: (650) 739-3900

35 *Attorneys for Defendant INTUIT INC.*

1 Dated: February 27, 2014

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

2
3 By: /s/ Emily Johnson Henn
Emily Johnson Henn

4 Robert T. Haslam, III
5 Emily Johnson Henn
333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700
6 Redwood City, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 632-4700

7 *Attorneys for Defendants PIXAR and LUCASFILM*
8 *LTD.*

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28